arXiv:math/0308137v1 [math.CA] 14 Aug 2003

SOME REMARKS ON SOME SECOND-ORDER ELLIPTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

TOKA DIAGANA

Abstract. We are concerned with the almost automorphic solutions to the second-order elliptic differential equations of type $\ddot{u}(s) + 2B\dot{u}(s) + Au(s) = f(s) \quad (*)$, where A, B are densely defined closed linear operators acting in a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ and $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is a vector-valued almost automorphic function. Using invariant subspaces, it will be shown that under appropriate assumptions; every solution to $(*)$ is almost automorphic.

1. Introduction

This paper deals with the almost automorphic solutions to the homogeneous second-order elliptic differential equation of the form

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}u(s) + 2B\,\frac{d}{ds}u(s) + A\,u(s) = 0 \tag{1}$$

and the associated nonhomogeneous differential equation

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}u(s) + 2B\,\frac{d}{ds}u(s) + A\,u(s) = f(s), \tag{2}$$

where A, B are densely defined closed unbounded linear operators acting in a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ and $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is an almost automorphic vector-valued function.

We use *invariant subspaces* theory to show that under appropriate assumptions; every solution to the equations (1) and/or (2) is an *almost automorphic* vector-valued function. The idea of using the method of invariant subspaces to study the existence of almost automorphic solutions is recent and due to Diagana and N'Guerekata[3]. Let us indicate that the invariant subspaces method works in the framework of abstract differential equations involving the algebraic sum of unbounded linear operators.

---

[1] 2000 AMS subject classification. 34G10; 47B44.

[2] Key words: almost automorphic functions; invariant subspace; reducing subspace.

Let us mention that the existence and uniqueness of solutions to equations (1)-(2) have been of great interest for many mathematicians in the past decades. Note the pioneer work of Krein[6] regarding the solvability to (1)-(2) over $s \in [0,1]$. Recently, many important contributions to this problem have been made in ([4], [7]). Now it goes back to focus on solutions of it that are almost automorphic.

Now setting $v(s) = \dfrac{d}{ds}u(s)$; the problem (1)-(2) can be rewritten in $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ of the form

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{U}(s) = (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B})\,\mathcal{U}(s) \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{U}(s) = (\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B})\,\mathcal{U}(s) + F(s), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{U}(s) = (u(s), v(s))$, $F(s) = (0, f(s))$ and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ are the operator matrices of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} O & I \\ -A & O \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} O & O \\ O & -2B \end{pmatrix},$$

on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$ with $D(\mathcal{A}) = D(A) \times \mathbb{H}$, $D(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{H} \times D(B)$ and O, I denote the zero and identity operators on $\mathbb{H}$, respectively. Since (1)-(2) is equivalent to (3)-(4); instead of studying (1)-(2), we will focus on the characterization of almost automorphic solutions to (3)-(4).

First we recall some tools in section 2, then we use them to prove our main results in section 3.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Invariant subspaces.** Let $\mathbb{H}$ be a Hilbert space and let $S \subset \mathbb{H}$ be a closed subspace. Let A be a densely closed unbounded linear operator on $\mathbb{H}$ and let P_S denote the orthogonal projection onto the subspace S.

Definition 2.1. S is said to be an *invariant subspace* for A if we have the inclusion $A(D(A) \cap S) \subset S$.

Example 2.2. Let us mention the following classical invariant subspaces for a given linear operator A defined in a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$.

1. $S = N(A) = \{x \in D(A) : \ Ax = 0\}$ is an invariant subspace for A.

2. Let $\lambda \in \sigma_p(A)$ (point spectrum); then $S = \{\lambda u \ / \ u \in D(A)\}$ is an invariant subspace for A.

Theorem 2.3. *The equality* $P_S A P_S = A P_S$ *is a necessary and sufficient condition for a subspace* S *to be invariant for a linear operator* A.

Proof. Assume $P_S A P_S = A P_S$ and if $x \in D(A) \cap S$, then $x = P_S x \in D(A)$ and $Ax = AP_S x = P_S A P_S x \in S$.

Conversely, if S is invariant for A; let $x \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $P_S x \in D(A)$. Then $AP_S x \in S$ and then $P_S A P_S = A P_S x$. Therefore $AP_S \subset P_S A P_S$. Since $D(AP_S) = D(P_S A P_S)$, it turns out that $AP_S = P_S A P_S$. □

Definition 2.4. A closed proper subspace S of the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ is said to reduce an operator A if $P_S D(A) \subset D(A)$ and both S and $H \ominus S$, the orthogonal complement of S, are invariant for A.

Using theorem 2.3, the following key result can be proved.

Theorem 2.5. *A closed subspace* S *of* $\mathbb{H}$ *reduces an operator* A *if and only if* $P_S A \subset A P_S$.

Proof. see the proof in [8, Theorem 4.11., p. 29]. □

Remark 2.6. In fact the meaning of the inclusion $P_S A \subset A P_S$ is that: if $x \in D(A)$, then $P_S x \in D(A)$ and $P_S A x = A P_S x$.

Throughout the paper $\mathbb{H}$, $D(C)$, $R(C)$ and $N(C)$, denote a Hilbert space, the the domain of C, the range and the kernel of the linear operator C, respectively. Let A and B be densely defined closed unbounded linear operators on $\mathbb{H}$. Recall that their algebraic sum is defined by

$$D(A+B) = D(A) \cap D(B) \ \text{ and } \ (A+B)x = Ax + Bx, \quad \forall x \in D(A) \cap D(B).$$

2.2. **Almost automorphic functions.**

Definition 2.7. A continuous function $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is said to be almost automorphic if for every sequence of real numbers (σ_n), there exists a subsequence (s_n) such that

$$g(t) = \lim_{n \mapsto \infty} f(t + s_n)$$

is well defined for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$f(t) = \lim_{n \mapsto \infty} g(t - s_n)$$

for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

The range of an almost automorphic function is relatively compact on $\mathbb{H}$, therefore it is bounded. Almost automorphic functions constitute a Banach space $\mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H})$ under the supnorm. They generalize naturally the concept of almost periodic functions as introduced by Bochner in the early sixties. For applications to differential equations, it is necessary to study derivatives and integrals of almost automorphic functions. This is well presented in [10]. We recall some results we need in the sequel:

Theorem 2.8. *Let* $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ *be an almost automorphic function and suppose that its derivative* $\dfrac{d}{dt}f(t)$ *exits and is uniformly continuous on* $\mathbb{R}$. *Then* $\dfrac{d}{dt}f(t)$ *is also almost automorphic.*

Theorem 2.9. *Let* $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ *be an almost automorphic function. Then the function* F *defined by* $F(t) = \int_0^t f(s)ds, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}$ *is almost automorphic iff its range is bounded in* $\mathbb{H}$.

The integral here is understood in Bochner's sense for vector-valued functions. Detailed proofs of these results can be found in [10].

Setting our main result, instead of assuming that similar assumptions hold as in [10, Theorem 4.4.1]; the following assumptions will be made:

The operator $\mathcal{A}$ is the infinitesimal generator of a c_0-group of bounded operators $(\mathcal{T}(t))_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$ such that

(i) $\mathcal{T}(s)\mathcal{U} : \ s \mapsto \mathcal{T}(s)\mathcal{U}$ is almost automorphic for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$
(ii) there exists $S \subset \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, a closed subspace that reduces the matrix $\mathcal{A}$
(iii) $R(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq S$
(iv) $\overline{D(A) \times N(B)} = \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$

3. The Main Results

3.1. **Almost Automorphic Solutions to(3)-(4).** We have the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *Under assumptions (i)-(ii)-(iii)-(iv). Then every solution to the differential equation (3) is almost automorphic.*

Proof. Step 1. Let $X(s)$ be a solution to (3). Clearly $X(s) \in D(\mathcal{A}) \cap D(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. Through out step 1., we assume that the solution $X(s) \in D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{B})$. Recall that $D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{B}) = D(A) \times N(B) \subset D(\mathcal{A}) \cap D(\mathcal{B})$.

Now decompose $X(s)$ as follows

$$X(s) = P_S X(s) + (I \times I - P_S) X(s), \tag{5}$$

where P_S, $(I \times I - P_S) = P_{[\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}]\ominus S}$ are the orthogonal projections (on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$)onto S and $[\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S$, respectively. Let us denote $(I \times I - P_S)$ by Q_S. Thus, we have

$$X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s) \tag{6}$$

Now, apply P_S to (3). Using Remark 2.6 for $\mathcal{A}$ (S reduces $\mathcal{A}$); it turns out that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_S \frac{d}{ds} X(s) &= \frac{d}{ds}(P_S X(s)) \\
&= P_S \mathcal{A} X(s) + P_S \mathcal{B} X(s) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + P_S \mathcal{B} X(s) \quad (S \text{ reduces } \mathcal{A} \text{ according to (ii)}) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + \mathcal{B} X(s) \quad (\mathcal{B} X(s) \subset S \text{ according to } (iii)) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) \quad (X(s) \in N(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{H} \times N(B)).
\end{aligned}$$

From $\dfrac{d}{ds}(P_S X(s)) = \mathcal{A} P_S X(s)$; it follows that

$$P_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(t) P_S X(0) \tag{7}$$

Now according to (i); the vector-valued function $s \mapsto P_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(t) P_S X(0)$ is almost automorphic.

In the same way; since $[\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus ([\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S) = S$. It follows that the closed subspace S reduces $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if $[\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S$ does. In other words, $[\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S$ reduces $\mathcal{A}$. That is, a similar remark as remark 2.6 holds when S is replaced by

$[\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds} Q_S X(s) &= Q_S \frac{d}{ds}(X(s)) \\
&= Q_S \mathcal{A} X(s) + Q_S \mathcal{B} X(s) \\
&= \mathcal{A} Q_S X(s) + Q_S \mathcal{B} X(s) \quad ([\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}] \ominus S \text{ reduces } \mathcal{A}) \\
&= \mathcal{A} Q_S X(s) \quad (Q_S \mathcal{B} X(s) = 0, \text{ since } R(\mathcal{B}) \subset S)
\end{aligned}$$

From the equation $\frac{d}{dt} Q_S X(s) = \mathcal{A} Q_S X(s)$; it follows that $s \mapsto Q_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) Q_S X(0)$ is almost automorphic (according to (i)).

Therefore $X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s)$ is also almost automorphic as the sum of almost automorphic vector-valued functions.

Step 2. Assume that the solution $X(s)$ to (3) is in $D(\mathcal{A}) \cap D(\mathcal{B})$ but not in $D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{B})$. According to assumption (iv); there exists a sequence $X_n(s) \in D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{B}) = D(A) \times N(B)$ that strongly converges to $X(s)$ as $n \mapsto \infty$.

Now, apply the previous procedure (step 1.) to the sequence $X_n(s)$. It turns out that $X_n(s) = P_S X_n(s) + Q_S X_n(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) P_S X_n(0) + \mathcal{T}(s) Q_S X_n(0)$ is also almost automorphic. It is also not hard to see that the sequence $\mathcal{T}(s) P_S X_n(0) + \mathcal{T}(s) Q_S X_n(0)$ uniformly converges to $X(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) P_S X(0) + \mathcal{T}(s) Q_S X(0)$. Hence, according to [10, Theorem 2.1.10, p. 18], the vector-valued function $X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s)$ is almost automorphic. □

We now get a slightly different version of N'Guerekata's result (see [10, Theorem 4.4. 1, p. 84]); in the case where $B: \mathbb{H} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathbb{H}$ (this implies that $\mathcal{B}$ is bounded on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$).

Corollary 3.2. Let $B: \mathbb{H} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ be a bounded linear operator in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$. Under assumptions (i)-(ii)-(iii)-(iv). Then every solution to the equation (3) is almost automorphic.

Proof. This an immediate consequence of the Theorem 3.1 to the case where $\mathcal{B}$ is a bounded linear operator; it is straightforward. □

Consider the nonhomogeneous equation (4). Assume that the vector valued function $f: \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{H}$ is almost automorphic. In fact, this implies that $F: s \mapsto (0, f(s))$ is in $\mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})$.

We have

Theorem 3.3. *Under assumption (i)-(ii)-(iii)-(iv); assume that* $f \in \mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{H})$. *Then every solution to the equation (4) is almost automorphic.*

Proof. Step 1. Let $X(s)$ be a solution to (4). As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we first assume that $X(s) \in D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{A})$. Now express $X(s)$ as $X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s)$, where P_S, $Q_S = (I \times I - P_S) = P_{[\mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}]\ominus S}$ are the orthogonal projections defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Using remark 2.6 for $\mathcal{A}$ (S reduces $\mathcal{A}$); it turns out that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_S \frac{d}{ds} X(s) &= \frac{d}{ds}(P_S X(s)) \\
&= P_S \mathcal{A} X(s) + P_S \mathcal{B} X(s) + P_S F(s) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + P_S \mathcal{B} X(s) + P_S F(s) \quad (S \text{ reduces } \mathcal{A}) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + \mathcal{B} X(s) + P_S F(s) \quad (\mathcal{B} X(s) \subset S \text{ according to (iii)}) \\
&= \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + P_S F(s) \quad (X(s) \in N(\mathcal{B}) = \mathbb{H} \times N(B)).
\end{aligned}$$

From $\frac{d}{ds}(P_S X(s)) = \mathcal{A} P_S X(s) + P_S F(s)$; it follows that

$$P_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) P_S X(0) + \int_0^s \mathcal{T}(s-\sigma) P_S F(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Set $G(s) = \int_0^s \mathcal{T}(s-\sigma) P_S F(\sigma) d\sigma$. According to assumption (i); $s \mapsto \mathcal{T}(s-\sigma) P_S F(\sigma)$ is an almost automorphic vector-valued function. Since the projection P_S is a bounded linear operator and that $F \in \mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})$; it follows that $\|G(s)\|$ is bounded. Hence, $s \mapsto G(s)$ is almost automorphic by [10, Theorem 2.9]. According to assumption (i), the vector-valued function $s \mapsto P_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) P_S X(0)$ is almost automorphic. Therefore $s \mapsto P_S X(s)$ is almost automorphic as the sum of almost automorphic vector-valued functions.

In the same way, it is not hard to see that $\frac{d}{ds}(Q_S X(s)) = \mathcal{A} Q_S X(s) + Q_S F(s)$ and that $Q_S X(s)$ can be expressed as

$$Q_S X(s) = \mathcal{T}(s) Q_S X(0) + \int_0^s \mathcal{T}(s-\sigma) Q_S F(\sigma) d\sigma.$$

Using similar arguments as above, it can be shown that $s \mapsto Q_S X(s)$ is almost automorphic. Therefore $X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s)$ is also an almost automorphic vector-valued function.

Step 2. Assume that the solution to (4) is in $D(\mathcal{A}) \cap D(\mathcal{B})$ but not in $D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{A})$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1; the assumption (iv) guarantees the existence of a sequence $X_n(s) \in D(\mathcal{A}) \cap N(\mathcal{B})$ that strongly converges to $X(s)$ and that

$$X_n(s) = \mathcal{T}(s)X_n(0) + \int_0^s \mathcal{T}(s-\sigma)F(\sigma)d\sigma$$

We also know that $X_n(s) \in \mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})$. It is not hard to see that $X_n(s)$ uniformly converges to $X(s) = P_S X(s) + Q_S X(s)$. Therefore, $X(s) \in \mathbb{A}A(\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H})$ as the uniform limit of an almost automorphic sequence. $\square$

Remark 3.4. Let us notice that the previous results (Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.3) still hold in the case where $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} : \mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H} \mapsto \mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}$ are bounded linear operator matrices on $\mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. In such a case, the following assumptions are required.

- $\mathcal{T}(s)\mathcal{U} : s \mapsto \mathcal{T}(s)\mathcal{U}$ is almost automorphic for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$
- there exists $S \subset \mathbb{H}\times\mathbb{H}$, a closed subspace that reduces the operator $\mathcal{A}$
- $\overline{R(\mathcal{B})} \subseteq S$
- $\overline{N(B)} = \mathbb{H}$.

References

1. T. Diagana and G. M. N'Guerekata, *On some Perturbations of some Abstract Differential Equations*, Commentationes Mathematicae, to appear.
2. T. Diagana and G. M. N'Guerekata, *Some Extension of the Bohr-Neugebauer- N'Guerekata Theorem*, Preprint.
3. T. Diagana and Gaston M. N'Guerekata, *Some Remarks on some Abstract Differential Equations,* Far East J. of Math. Sci. **8**(3) (2003), 313-322.
4. A. El Haial and R. Labbas, *On the Ellipticity and Solvability of an Abstract Second-Order Differential Equations*, Electronic Journal of differential Equations, Vol. 2001 (2001), No. 57, pp. 1-18.
5. J.A. Goldstein, *Convexity, boundedness and almost periodicity for differential equations in Hilbert Spaces*, Int. J. Math. and Math. Sci., **2**(1979), 1-13.
6. S. G. Krein, *Linear Differential Equations in Banach Spaces*, Moscou, (1967).
7. R. Labbas, *Equation elliptique abstraite du second ordre et équation parabolique pour le problème de Cauchy abstrait*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, t. **305**, Série I, (1987), 785-788.
8. J. Locker, *Spectral Theory of Non-Self-Adjoint Two-Point Differential Operators*, AMS Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. **73**, (2000).

9. G.M. N'Guerekata, *Almost automorphic functions and applications to abstract evolution equations*, Cont. Math. AMS **252**(1999), p. 71-76.
10. G.M. N'Guerekata, *Almost Automorphic Functions and Almost Periodic Functions in Abstract Spaces*, Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, New York-London-Moscow, 2001.
11. S. Zaidman, *Topics in Abstract Differential Equations* Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Ser. II John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1994-1995.

Department of Mathematics, Howard University, 2441 6th Street N.W. Wasington D.C. 20059, USA

E-mail address: `tdiagana@howard.edu`